

1 PAUL B. BEACH, State Bar No. 166265  
pbeach@lbaclaw.com  
2 JAMES S. EICHER, State Bar No. 213796  
jeicher@lbaclaw.com  
3 LAWRENCE BEACH ALLEN & CHOI, PC  
100 West Broadway, Suite 1200  
4 Glendale, California 91210-1219  
Telephone No. (818) 545-1925  
5 Facsimile No. (818) 545-1937

6 Attorneys for Defendants  
County of Ventura and Ventura County  
7 Sheriff Geoff Dean

8  
9 **UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT**  
10 **CENTRAL DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA**

11 Guadalupe Raya, individually and as  
12 Successor in Interest,

13 Plaintiff,

14 vs.

15 County Of Ventura, Ventura County  
Sheriff Geoff Dean, California Forensic  
16 Medical Group, Incorporated,  
Geronimo Soloranzo, and DOES 1  
17 through 100, inclusive,

18 Defendants.  
19  
20

Case No. CV 15-07673 CBM (JCx)

Honorable Consuelo B. Marshall

**DEFENDANTS' ANSWER TO  
FIRST AMENDED COMPLAINT  
FOR DAMAGES; DEMAND FOR  
JURY TRIAL**

21 COME NOW Defendants County of Ventura and Ventura County Sheriff  
22 Geoff Dean (hereinafter "Defendants"), and answering the First Amended  
23 Complaint for Damages (hereinafter "Complaint") on file herein, for themselves  
24 and for no others, admit, deny and allege as follows:  
25

26 1. Answering Paragraph 1 of the First Amended Complaint, Defendants  
27 deny that the case meets the requirements of a federal civil rights action but admit  
28 that under the facts alleged, the Court has subject matter jurisdiction over

1 Plaintiff's claims at this time.

2       2.     Answering Paragraph 2 of the First Amended Complaint, Defendants  
3 admit that venue is proper.

4       3.     Answering Paragraph 3 of the First Amended Complaint, Defendants  
5 do not have sufficient information or belief to enable them to answer and on that  
6 ground, deny each and every other allegation contained therein.

7       4.     Answering Paragraph 4 of the First Amended Complaint, Defendants  
8 admit that the County of Ventura is a municipal entity organized and existing  
9 under the laws of the State of California. Defendants further admit that the  
10 Ventura County Sheriff's Department ("VCSD") is created under the laws of the  
11 State of California and is an agency of the County of Ventura. Defendants deny  
12 each and every other allegation contained therein.

13       5.     Answering Paragraph 5 of the First Amended Complaint, Defendants  
14 admit that Ventura County Sheriff Geoff Dean was the highest ranking member  
15 and head of the Ventura County Sheriff's Department at all times relevant to this  
16 litigation. Defendants deny as overly broad the remaining allegations of this  
17 paragraph that Sheriff Geoff Dean was personally responsible for every policy,  
18 custom and procedure, and deny Sheriff Geoff Dean was personally responsible  
19 for all management, supervision, and training of department personnel.  
20 Defendants likewise deny the allegations contained within sentence two of this  
21 paragraph that Sheriff Geoff Dean is responsible for selection, promotion,  
22 supervision, training, discipline and retention of agents, counselors, advisors,  
23 nurses, doctors, physician assistants, medical staff, mental health staff, education  
24 staff and supervisors working at the Ventura County Jail. Defendants deny that  
25 Sheriff Geoff Dean committed any wrongful acts whatsoever and deny that he  
26 should be sued in his individual capacity, because he had no personal contact  
27 whatsoever with the plaintiff's decedent.

28       6.     Answering Paragraph 6 of the First Amended Complaint, Defendants

1 admit that California Forensic Medical Group was the specified provider of  
2 medical services and staff at the Ventura County Jail and under contract to  
3 provide medical care and attention to inmates. Defendants deny any agency and  
4 admit that the medical care provider has an independent professional  
5 responsibility to patients which Defendants do not control or manage.

6 7. Answering Paragraph 7 of the First Amended Complaint, Defendants  
7 admit that Plaintiff is attempting to name Geronimo Solorzano as a defendant in  
8 this matter but do not have sufficient information or belief to enable them to  
9 answer said Paragraph, and on that ground, deny the allegations contained  
10 therein.

11 8. Answering Paragraph 8 of the First Amended Complaint, the  
12 identities of these fictitious defendants are unknown and therefore Defendants do  
13 not have sufficient information or belief to enable them to answer and on that  
14 ground, deny each and every allegation contained therein.

15 9. Answering Paragraph 9 of the First Amended Complaint, Defendants  
16 object to the allegations of this paragraph as compound and calling for legal  
17 conclusions. Defendants admit that California Forensic Medical Group is a  
18 medical provision contractor for the Ventura County Jail, but deny agency.  
19 Defendants also do not have sufficient information or belief to enable them to  
20 answer and on that ground, deny each and every allegation contained therein.

21 10. Answering Paragraph 10 of the First Amended Complaint,  
22 Defendants admit that prior to the filing of this Complaint Plaintiff served the  
23 County of Ventura with a timely Government Tort Claim for money damages and  
24 that said claim was rejected.

25 11. Answering Paragraphs 11,16, 21-22, 25-27, 31-44, 47-50, 53, 59-60,  
26 63-65, 68-69, and the Prayer for Relief of the First Amended Complaint  
27 (subsequent to Paragraph 74 and each Claim for Relief found within pages 22  
28 through 24 of the First Amended Complaint), Defendants deny generally and

1 specifically each and every allegation contained therein, and further deny that  
2 Plaintiff is entitled to an award of damages, or any other relief as a result of any  
3 act or omission by these Defendants.

4 12. Answering Paragraphs 12 and 13, of the First Amended Complaint,  
5 Defendants do not have sufficient information or belief to enable them to answer  
6 and on that ground, deny each and every other allegation contained therein.

7 13. Answering Paragraph 14 of the First Amended Complaint,  
8 Defendants admit that Plaintiff's decedent, Edgar Solorzano was booked at the  
9 Ventura County Jail on October 3, 2014. Defendants admit that Ventura County  
10 Sheriff personnel requested that Plaintiff's decedent, Edgar Solorzano, be  
11 evaluated by medical personnel as alleged in sentence two of this paragraph. As  
12 to the remainder of the allegations set forth in Paragraph 14 of the First Amended  
13 Complaint, Defendants do not have sufficient information or belief to enable  
14 them to answer and on that ground, deny each and every other allegation  
15 contained therein.

16 14. Answering Paragraphs 15, 17, 18 and 19 of the First Amended  
17 Complaint, Defendants admit that these paragraphs attempt to summarize specific  
18 portions of Edgar Solorzano's medical records during his confinement at the  
19 Ventura County Jail. However, Defendants do not have sufficient information or  
20 belief to enable them to answer and on that ground, deny each and every  
21 allegation contained therein. Defendants deny any implication or allegation that  
22 they did not properly care for Plaintiff's decedent on or about April 16, 2015, or  
23 at any other time while Plaintiff's decedent was in custody.

24 15. Answering Paragraph 20 of the First Amended Complaint, as for  
25 sentence one, Defendants admit that a California Penal Code § 1368 hearing was  
26 held regarding whether the decedent was competent to stand trial and that as a  
27 result the decedent was ordered to be placed at Patton State Hospital. However,  
28 Defendants do not have sufficient information or belief to enable them to answer

1 and on that ground, deny each and every other allegation contained therein.

2 16. Answering Paragraph 23 of the First Amended Complaint,  
3 Defendants admit that on May 25, 2015, Edgar Solorzano hung himself in the  
4 Ventura County Jail using a sheet. Defendants deny generally and specifically  
5 each and every other allegation contained within this paragraph.

6 17. Answering Paragraph 24 of the First Amended Complaint,  
7 Defendants admit the allegations contained therein.

8 18. Answering Paragraph 28 of the First Amended Complaint,  
9 Defendants incorporate by reference their response to Paragraphs 1-27 as though  
10 fully set forth herein.

11 19. Answering Paragraph 29 of the First Amended Complaint, while  
12 Defendants admit that Plaintiff accurately summarizes portions of 42 U.S.C.  
13 Section 1983, Defendants deny generally and specifically liability for any alleged  
14 violations.

15 20. Answering Paragraph 30 of the First Amended Complaint, while  
16 Defendants admit that a custodial official's subjective deliberate indifference to  
17 the safety and medical needs of a pretrial detainee may constitute a violation of  
18 the 14th Amendment, Defendants deny any implication or allegation that they did  
19 not properly care for Plaintiff's decedent on or about April 16, 2015, or at any  
20 other time while he was in custody.

21 21. Answering Paragraph 45 of the First Amended Complaint,  
22 Defendants incorporate by reference their response to Paragraphs 1-44 as though  
23 fully set forth herein.

24 22. Answering Paragraph 46 of the First Amended Complaint,  
25 Defendants admit that Plaintiff attempts to summarize statutory and case law  
26 surrounding her state law Wrongful Death claim. Defendants deny that Plaintiff  
27 has standing to pursue these causes of action and deny generally and specifically  
28 liability under this state cause of action.

1           23.    Answering Paragraph 51 of the First Amended Complaint,  
2 Defendants incorporate by reference their response to Paragraphs 1-50 as though  
3 fully set forth herein.

4           24.    Answering Paragraph 52 of the First Amended Complaint,  
5 Defendants admit that Plaintiff attempts to summarize the enactment and scope of  
6 the Americans With Disabilities Act, The Rehabilitation Act, The Unruh Act, and  
7 California Civil Code § 51 et seq. Defendants deny generally and specifically  
8 liability under these claims for relief.

9           25.    Answering Paragraph 54 of the First Amended Complaint,  
10 Defendants admit that the County of Ventura is a public entity under the laws of  
11 the State of California and that the Ventura County Sheriff's Department is a  
12 department of the County. Defendants admit that Title II of the ADA prohibits a  
13 public entity from discriminating against a qualified individual with a disability  
14 on the basis of a disability. As to the remainder of the allegations stated in this  
15 Paragraph, the allegations are vague and ambiguous and, on that basis,  
16 Defendants deny generally and specifically said allegations.

17           26.    Answering Paragraph 55 of the First Amended Complaint, the  
18 allegations contained within this Paragraph are vague and ambiguous and, on that  
19 basis, Defendants deny generally and specifically said allegations.

20           27.    Answering Paragraph 56 of the First Amended Complaint,  
21 Defendants admit that the ADA imposes certain requirements regarding the  
22 accessibility of services and programs to individuals with qualifying disabilities.  
23 As to the remainder of the allegations set forth in this Paragraph, they are vague  
24 and ambiguous and, on that basis, Defendants deny generally and specifically said  
25 allegations.

26           28.    Answering Paragraph 57 of the First Amended Complaint,  
27 Defendants admit that the ADA imposes certain requirements regarding the  
28 accessibility of services and programs to individuals with qualifying disabilities.

1 Defendants admit that the ADA prohibits a public entity from discriminating  
2 against a qualified individual with a disability on the basis of a disability. As to  
3 the remainder of the allegations set forth in this Paragraph, these Defendants do  
4 not have sufficient information or belief to enable them to answer said Paragraph,  
5 and on that ground, deny each and every allegation contained therein.

6 29. Answering Paragraph 58 of the First Amended Complaint, the  
7 allegations are vague and ambiguous and, on that basis, Defendants deny  
8 generally and specifically said allegations.

9 30. Answering Paragraph 61 of the First Amended Complaint,  
10 Defendants incorporate by reference their response to Paragraphs 1-60 as though  
11 fully set forth herein.

12 31. Answering Paragraph 62 of the First Amended Complaint,  
13 Defendants admit that Plaintiff attempts to summarize Government Code Section  
14 845.6 and deny generally and specifically liability under this claim for relief.

15 32. Answering Paragraph 66 of the First Amended Complaint,  
16 Defendants incorporate by reference their response to Paragraphs 1-65 as though  
17 fully set forth herein.

18 33. Answering Paragraph 67 of the First Amended Complaint,  
19 Defendants object to the allegations of this paragraph as compound and calling  
20 for legal conclusions. Defendants deny generally and specifically liability under  
21 this claim for relief.

22 34. Answering Paragraph 70 of the First Amended Complaint,  
23 Defendants incorporate by reference their response to Paragraphs 1-69 as though  
24 fully set forth herein.

25 35. Answering Paragraphs 71-74 of the First Amended Complaint, this  
26 sixth claim for relief (Medical Malpractice) is not alleged against Defendants  
27 County of Ventura and Ventura County Sheriff Geoff Dean. These are medically  
28 specific allegations whose truth or falsity will need to be addressed by co-



1 defendant, CFMG.

2 **FIRST AFFIRMATIVE DEFENSE**

3 36. Defendant Ventura County Sheriff Geoff Dean and the County of  
4 Ventura's employee(s) is/are entitled to qualified immunity since the applicable  
5 law was not clearly established and since a reasonable official in his/her position  
6 could have believed his/her conduct was lawful.

7 **SECOND AFFIRMATIVE DEFENSE**

8 37. That Plaintiff's Complaint for Damages does not state facts  
9 sufficient to constitute a cause of action against these Defendants under 42 U.S.C.  
10 § 1983 because simple negligence pursuant to the United States Supreme Court  
11 decision of *Parratt v. Taylor*, 451 U.S. 527, 101 S.Ct. 1908, 68 L.Ed.2d 420  
12 (1981), is not a federal civil rights violation.

13 **THIRD AFFIRMATIVE DEFENSE**

14 38. Plaintiff's Complaint for Damages fails to state a cause of action  
15 against these answering Defendants.

16 **FOURTH AFFIRMATIVE DEFENSE**

17 39. Under the Civil Rights Act, where intent is an element of the claim,  
18 the facts must be alleged in the Complaint with specificity.

19 **FIFTH AFFIRMATIVE DEFENSE**

20 40. Neither a public entity nor a public employee is liable for his act or  
21 omission, exercising due care, in the execution or enforcement of any law.

22 **SIXTH AFFIRMATIVE DEFENSE**

23 41. Neither a public entity nor a public employee is liable for any injury  
24 caused by the act or omission of another person.

25 **SEVENTH AFFIRMATIVE DEFENSE**

26 42. Neither a public entity nor a public employee is liable for any injury  
27 resulting from his act or omission where the act or omission was the result of the  
28 exercise of the discretion vested in him, whether or not such discretion is abused.



1 **EIGHTH AFFIRMATIVE DEFENSE**

2 43. Neither a public entity nor a public employee acting in good faith,  
3 without malice, and under the apparent authority of an enactment that is  
4 unconstitutional, invalid or inapplicable, is liable for any injury caused thereby,  
5 except to the extent that he would have been liable had the enactment been  
6 constitutional, valid and applicable.

7 **NINTH AFFIRMATIVE DEFENSE**

8 44. Neither a public entity nor a public employee is liable for failure to  
9 establish a police department or otherwise provide police protection service or, if  
10 public protection service is provided, for failure to provide sufficient police  
11 protection service.

12 **TENTH AFFIRMATIVE DEFENSE**

13 45. Neither a public entity nor a public employee is liable for an injury  
14 caused by the adoption of or failure to adopt an enactment or by the failure to  
15 enforce an enactment.

16 **ELEVENTH AFFIRMATIVE DEFENSE**

17 46. Neither a public entity nor a public employee acting in the scope of  
18 employment is liable for injuries caused by misrepresentation, whether negligent  
19 or intentional, unless the public employee is guilty of actual fraud, corruption, or  
20 actual malice.

21 **TWELFTH AFFIRMATIVE DEFENSE**

22 47. Any injury to Plaintiff and/or Decedent was due to and caused by the  
23 negligence and omissions of the Plaintiff and/or Decedent to care for themselves,  
24 which carelessness and negligence and omissions were the proximate cause of the  
25 damage, if any, to Plaintiff and/or Decedent.

26 **THIRTEENTH AFFIRMATIVE DEFENSE**

27 48. The damages, if any, should be in direct proportion to the fault of  
28 these Defendants, if any, as provided by Civil Code §§ 1431 to 1431.5.

1 **FOURTEENTH AFFIRMATIVE DEFENSE**

2 49. To the extent that Plaintiff and/or Decedent suffered any detriment,  
3 such detriment was caused or contributed to by Plaintiff's and/or Decedent's  
4 negligence and damage, if any, should be reduced in direct proportion to their  
5 fault.

6 **FIFTEENTH AFFIRMATIVE DEFENSE**

7 50. The injuries and damages alleged by Plaintiff and/or Decedent, if  
8 any, were proximately caused by the negligence, conduct and liability of other  
9 persons or entities, and Defendants request that an allocation of such negligence,  
10 conduct and liability be made among such other persons or entities, and that, if  
11 any liability is found on the part of Defendants, judgment against Defendants be  
12 only in an amount which is proportionate to the extent and percentage by which  
13 these Defendants' acts or omissions contributed to Plaintiff's and/or Decedent's  
14 injuries or damages, if at all.

15 **SIXTEENTH AFFIRMATIVE DEFENSE**

16 51. The negligence of a third-party or parties was a superseding,  
17 intervening cause of Plaintiff's and/or Decedent's injuries.

18 **SEVENTEENTH AFFIRMATIVE DEFENSE**

19 52. Each of Plaintiff's state law claims are barred by the absolute  
20 "official duty" privilege of Civil Code § 47(a).

21 **EIGHTEENTH AFFIRMATIVE DEFENSE**

22 53. Each of Plaintiff's state law claims are barred as having some  
23 connection with or logical relation to an "official proceeding" within the absolute  
24 privilege of Civil Code § 47(b).

25 **NINETEENTH AFFIRMATIVE DEFENSE**

26 54. Each of Plaintiff's state law claims are barred by the absolute  
27 privilege of Government Code § 821.6.  
28

1 **TWENTIETH AFFIRMATIVE DEFENSE**

2 55. Each of Plaintiff's state law claims are barred by the absolute  
3 privilege of Government Code § 820.2.

4 **TWENTY-FIRST AFFIRMATIVE DEFENSE**

5 56. The Complaint for Damages and individual theories of relief set  
6 forth therein are barred by Plaintiff's failure to have complied with the California  
7 public entity and public employee claims filing provisions.

8 **TWENTY-SECOND AFFIRMATIVE DEFENSE**

9 57. This action is barred by the applicable statutes of limitations,  
10 including but not limited to California Code of Civil Procedure §§ 335.1, 339,  
11 340, and 342.

12 **TWENTY-THIRD AFFIRMATIVE DEFENSE**

13 58. Defendant is not liable pursuant to the doctrine of assumption of  
14 risk.

15 **TWENTY-FOURTH AFFIRMATIVE DEFENSE**

16 59. Plaintiff's claims are barred by the doctrine of unclean hands.

17 **TWENTY-FIFTH AFFIRMATIVE DEFENSE**

18 60. Plaintiff's claims are barred by the doctrine of laches.

19 **TWENTY-SIXTH AFFIRMATIVE DEFENSE**

20 61. A public entity is not required to take any action that it can  
21 demonstrate would result in undue financial and administrative burdens, pursuant  
22 to 28 C.F.R. § 35.150(a)(3).

23 **TWENTY-SEVENTH AFFIRMATIVE DEFENSE**

24 62. A public entity is not required to take any action that it can show  
25 would result in a fundamental alteration in the nature of a service, program, or  
26 activity, pursuant to 28 C.F.R. § 35.150(a)(3).

27 **TWENTY-EIGHTH AFFIRMATIVE DEFENSE**

28 63. Plaintiff and/or Decedent have failed to mitigate their damages.

1                   **TWENTY-NINTH AFFIRMATIVE DEFENSE**

2           64.     Plaintiff's claims for relief and request for attorneys' fees are  
3 limited, in whole or in part, by the Prison Litigation Reform Act.

4                   **THIRTIETH AFFIRMATIVE DEFENSE**

5           65.     That any injury or damage suffered by Plaintiff and/or Decedent was  
6 caused solely by reason of Decedent's wrongful acts and not by reason of any  
7 unlawful acts or omissions of these Defendants.

8                   **THIRTY-FIRST AFFIRMATIVE DEFENSE**

9           66.     The County Sheriff and his subordinates act on behalf of the State,  
10 not the County, where engaged in law enforcement activities, consequently, any  
11 policies, practices or customs alleged in the Complaint are not those of the  
12 County.

13                   **THIRTY-SECOND AFFIRMATIVE DEFENSE**

14           67.     These Defendants are immune from liability pursuant to Government  
15 Code § 845.2, which provides immunity from liability for failure to provide  
16 sufficient jail equipment, personnel or facilities.

17                   **THIRTY-THIRD AFFIRMATIVE DEFENSE**

18           68.     These Defendants are immune from liability pursuant to Government  
19 Code § 844.6 which provides immunity from liability for an injury proximately  
20 caused by any prisoner or to any prisoner.

21                   **THIRTY- FOURTH AFFIRMATIVE DEFENSE**

22           69.     Defendants are not liable for failure to make reasonable  
23 accommodation to individuals who did not make their disability known to  
24 Defendants.

25                   **THIRTY-FIFTH AFFIRMATIVE DEFENSE**

26           70.     Plaintiff lacks standing to pursue claims for relief as the successor-  
27 in-interest to the Decedent pursuant to Cal. Code of Civil Procedure § 377.10 and  
28 §377.11.

**THIRTY-SIXTH AFFIRMATIVE DEFENSE**

71. Plaintiffs have failed to join all necessary parties to this action.

**THIRTY-SEVENTH AFFIRMATIVE DEFENSE**

72. Defendant is not legally responsible for the acts and/or omissions of the DOE defendants.

**THIRTY-EIGHTH AFFIRMATIVE DEFENSE**

73. The County of Ventura is immune from liability under the Eleventh Amendment to the Constitution of the United States of America.

**THIRTY-NINTH AFFIRMATIVE DEFENSE**

74. Liability for punitive damages is precluded by the absence of malice, in general, and the absence of clear and convincing evidence thereof, in particular, as required by Civil Code Section 3294(a) and (c), and pursuant to Government Code § 818, and Newport City v. Fact Concerts, Inc., 453 U.S. 247, 69 L.Ed.2d 616, 101 S.Ct. 2748 (1981).

**FORTIETH AFFIRMATIVE DEFENSE**

75. Plaintiff's Complaint fails to state a cause of action against these Defendants for punitive damages in that punitive damages violate due process of law rights.

**FORTY-FIRST AFFIRMATIVE DEFENSE**

76. Plaintiff lacks standing to pursue claims for relief as the successor-in-interest to the Decedent pursuant to Cal. Code of Civil Procedure §§ 377.30 et seq.

**FORTY-SECOND AFFIRMATIVE DEFENSE**

77. Each of Plaintiff's claims against the public entity Defendant is barred by Government Code § 815.2(b).

**FORTY-THIRD AFFIRMATIVE DEFENSE**

78. Plaintiff's claims for municipal liability pursuant to U.S.C. 42 Section 1983 are barred pursuant to the holding and rationale of *Venegas v.*

1 *County of Los Angeles* (2004) 32 Cal.4th 820, 828-839 and *County of Los Angeles*  
2 *v. Superior Court (Peters)* (1998) 68 Cal.App.4th 1166, 1171.

3 **FORTY-FOURTH AFFIRMATIVE DEFENSE**

4 79. Since a Sheriff acts as a state policymaker when engaged in law  
5 enforcement activities, neither the County, or its Sheriff's Department, nor the  
6 Sheriff when sued in his official capacity are County policymakers with respect to  
7 lawsuits arising from the law enforcement activities and, as such, are not  
8 "persons" subject to suit under § 1983.

9 **FORTY-FIFTH AFFIRMATIVE DEFENSE**

10 80. Plaintiff's decedent's refusal to follow medical recommendations  
11 and prescribed care is a superseding cause of any alleged injuries and Plaintiff's  
12 claims are barred by the doctrine of waiver and release.

13 **FORTY-SIXTH AFFIRMATIVE DEFENSE**

14 81. No Defendant actually knew of and deliberately disregarded an  
15 excessive risk to the inmate decedent's health and safety or otherwise satisfied the  
16 standards for constitutional liability.

17 **FORTY-SEVENTH AFFIRMATIVE DEFENSE**

18 82. No defendant exhibited subjective deliberate indifference, the  
19 requisite federal culpability standard, and therefore cannot be liable to plaintiff.

20 **FORTY-EIGHTH AFFIRMATIVE DEFENSE**

21 83. Plaintiff lacks standing to pursue claims for relief because she does  
22 not meet the statutory burden of demonstrating that she was financially dependent  
23 upon her decedent pursuant to Cal. Code of Civil Procedure § 377.60 (b).

24 **FORTY-NINTH AFFIRMATIVE DEFENSE**

25 84. Any state-law theory of recovery is precluded by the California  
26 Government Code provisions in §§ 845.6, 855.6, 855.8, 856 as well as 856.4.

27 Wherefore, Defendants County of Ventura and Ventura County Sheriff  
28 Geoff Dean pray that Plaintiff takes nothing by way of the Complaint for

1 Damages and that Defendants County of Ventura and Ventura County Sheriff  
2 Geoff Dean herein recover costs and such other and further relief as the Court  
3 may deem just and proper.

4  
5 Dated: October 26, 2015

LAWRENCE BEACH ALLEN & CHOI, PC

6  
7 By           /s/ James S. Eicher, Jr.            
8 Paul B. Beach  
9 James S. Eicher, Jr.  
10 Attorneys for Defendants  
County of Ventura and  
Ventura County Sheriff Geoff Dean



**DEMAND FOR JURY TRIAL**

TO THE CLERK OF THE ABOVE-ENTITLED COURT:

PLEASE TAKE NOTICE that Defendants County of Ventura and Ventura County Sheriff Geoff Dean demand a trial by jury pursuant to Federal Rules of Civil Procedure, Rule 38(b) and Local Rule 3.4.10.1.

Dated: October 26, 2015                      LAWRENCE BEACH ALLEN & CHOI, PC

By           /s/ James S. Eicher, Jr.            
Paul B. Beach  
James S. Eicher, Jr.  
Attorneys for Defendants  
County of Ventura and  
Ventura County Sheriff Geoff Dean